



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,880	08/31/2001	Frederic Spaey	490092000200	9481
25227	7590	09/30/2005	EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER-LLP 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD SUITE 300 MCLEAN, VA 22102			PHAM, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/942,880	SPAETY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael D. Pham	2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

AT

Detailed Action

Claims States

1. Claims 1-16 have been examined.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending.
3. Claims 1-16 are rejected as detailed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the search restrictions" in line 2 of claim 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by The Anatomy of a Large-Scale Hypertextual Web Search Engine, by Sergey Brin and Lawrence Page. (hereafter referred to as Brin).

Claim 1

Brin discloses a data processing method comprising:

incrementally¹ searching structured data based on a search request (Brin, 4.2 Major Data Structures²); and

displaying a search result of the searched structured data based on the search request through an Internet browser (Brin, 5 Results and Performance figure 4 and paragraph 2)

Claim 2

Brin discloses the data processing method wherein the data processing method further comprises storing the displayed search result on a remote server (5 Results and Performance paragraph³ 2 and figure 4).

Claim 8

Brin discloses the data processing method further comprising sorting the search result (Brin, 2.1 PageRank: Bringing Order to the web⁴)

¹ Examiner interprets as increasing.

² Increasing amount of structured data is searched based on user request. Google expands (i.e. increases) amount of data that is to be searched.

³ By inviting users there exists a remote server.

⁴ Results are prioritized based on PageRank

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-7 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brin in view of Mastering Access 97 Fourth Edition for Windows 95/NT by Alan Simpson and Elizabeth Olson (hereafter referred to as Simpson).

Claim 3

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as stated above. However does not explicitly disclose the steps of, combining a search on multiple columns of a search interface. On the other hand, Simpson discloses combining a search on multiple columns of a search interface (Simpson, pages 1013-1015⁵). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brin to include the step of combining a search on multiple columns of a search interface based on the disclosure of Simpson. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of filtering and sorting more relevant results for display. Thereby filtering out irrelevant results, which is a main goal in search engine technology.

⁵ Multiple fields or columns in this case, maybe searched for specific values and combining fields (i.e. multiple columns) for search by filtering results of a table.

Claim 4

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as noted above. However, Brin does not explicitly disclose the steps of reducing a list box for a column to possible values based on search restrictions imposed by searches in other columns. On the other hand, Simpson discloses reducing a list box for a column to possible values based on search restrictions imposed by searches in other columns (Simpson, pages 525-526⁶). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brin to include reducing a list box for a column to possible values based on search restrictions imposed by searches in other columns based on the disclosure of Simpson. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of filtering and sorting more relevant results for display. Thereby filtering out irrelevant results, which is a main goal in the search engine technology.

Claim 5

Brin in view of Simpson discloses a data processing method that further comprises selecting search values from a dropdown list box for a column containing existing values for the column (Simpson, pages 525-526⁷).

Claim 6

Brin in view of Simpson discloses reducing the dropdown list box for the column to possible values based on the search restrictions imposed by searches in other columns (Simpson,

⁶ list boxes and combo boxes maybe reduced used for search restrictions imposed by searches in other columns by selecting which fields and values that should be imposed.

⁷ list boxes and combo boxes maybe used for search restrictions imposed by searches in other columns by selecting which fields and values that should be imposed.

page 527⁸).

Claim 7

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as noted above. However, Brin does not explicitly disclose the steps of searching on each individual column of a search interface. On the other hand, Simpson discloses a data processing method further comprising searching on each individual column of a search interface by selecting a field or column, and search for a record that contains that attribute (Simpson, page 75⁹). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify Brin to include a search on each individual column of a search interface based on the disclosure of Simpson. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of having a highly selective search (Simpson, page 75¹⁰). It is further known that filtering out irrelevant results is a main goal in the search engine technology.

Claim 9

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as noted above. However, Brin does not explicitly disclose the steps of sorting the search result based on a specific column. On the other hand, Simpson discloses a data processing method comprising sorting the search result based on a specific column (Simpson, 309-312¹¹) . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made

⁸ Limits to the list, limits the dropdown list box to values that are only valid

⁹ Discloses searching each individual column of a search interface by selecting a field or column, and searching for a record that contains that attribute.

¹⁰ Example of a thousand records of peoples' names and addresses in which a user only needs the address of a specific person

to modify Brin to include sorting the search result based on a specific column, in reference to the disclosure of Simpson skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so in order to improve the search criteria for the purpose of obtaining results in a meaningful order (Simpson, page 309¹²). For example viewing a list of names maybe much more easily read and kept track of in alphabetical order than it would be to just search for all names containing the same last name. It is further known that producing relevant results is a main goal in search engine technology.

Claim 10

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as noted above. However, Brin does not explicitly disclose searching using search operators. On the other hand, Simpson discloses searching using search operators (Simpson, pages 336-342¹³). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify Brin to include the use of search operators for searching based on the disclosure of Simpson. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of sorting out the proposed results. It is further known that producing relevant results is a main goal in the search engine technology.

Claim 11

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as noted above. However, Brin does not explicitly disclose the steps of modifying a display column width. On the

¹¹ Sorting columns

¹² meaningful order.

¹³ using search operators to filter out irrelevant selections.

other hand, Simpson discloses a method for modifying a display column width (Simpson, page 192). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify Brin to include modifying a display column width based on the disclosure of Simpson, a skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify a display column width for the purpose of ordering present results in a structural format while easily manipulating widths in order to view information presented. It is well known to one of ordinary skill that web documents based on hypertext markup language must all manipulate rows and columns in order to present information where it should be presented. By allowing changes to column widths it is gainfully easier to view information. This is heavily noticeable in a "What you see is what you get" application such as Macromedia Dreamweaver. Therefore, by improving upon the graphical user interface it accomplishes a user-friendly system, which is a well-known goal in the art of computer technology.

Claim 12

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as noted above. However, Brin does not explicitly disclose displaying a next or previous page search result. On the other hand, Simpson discloses a next or previous page search result (Simpson page 267-269¹⁴, and Fig. 8.5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify Brin to include next or previous page results based on the disclosure of Simpson, a skilled artisan would have been motivated for the purpose of navigation (Simpson, page 267). By navigating

¹⁴ next or previous page search results are shown by advancing through records By clicking onto the left record button previous results are shown. By clicking on the right record button, next records are shown

through results or records it again gives a user an easier view of the information. Therefore, by improving upon the graphical user interface it accomplishes a user-friendly system, which is a well-known goal in the art of computer technology.

Claim 13

Brin in view of Simpson discloses displaying next or previous columns of a search result (Simpson, pages 267-269¹⁵).

Claim 14

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as noted above. However, Brin does not explicitly disclose the steps of selecting a table of a source database. On the other hand, Simpson discloses selecting a table of a source database (Simpson, page 360¹⁶). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify Brin to include selecting a table of a source database based on the disclosure of Simpson, a skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of allowing questions to be answered about the data obtained (Simpson, page 359). It is further known that producing relevant results is a main goal in the search engine technology.

Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brin as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "Tutorial #14" by Paul Rowe (hereafter referred to as Rowe).

¹⁵ next and previous columns of search results are shown by scroll bars. Left going to the previous columns, right going to the next columns

¹⁶ by using a select query a table from the database maybe selected.

Claim 15

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as stated above. However, Brin does not explicitly disclose the steps of automatically refreshing the search result. On the other hand, Rowe discloses automatically refreshing results [Rowe, HTTP-EQUIV¹⁷]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention was made to modify Brin to include automatically refreshing the search results based on the disclosure of Rowe. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of obtaining updated information. The browser may contain older information, in which case, automatically updating the document is a necessity when viewing search results. It is just as important to receive results as it is to filtering results.

Claim 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brin as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of “Blogger” by Pyra Inc. (hereafter referred to as Pyra).

Claim 16

Brin discloses all the limitations of the data processing as noted above. However, Brin does not explicitly disclose the steps of configuring a specific skin for an interface. On the other hand, Pyra allows configuring a specific skin for an interface (Pyra, page 1¹⁸). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to

¹⁷ Automatically updates browser.

¹⁸ a web publishing tool that keeps a record of online postings, allows user to change template of web page.

modify Brin to include a specific skin for an interface based on the disclosure of Pyra, a skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of indicating how objects / postings should appear (Pyra, page 1¹⁹). It is further realized how important a graphical user interface is for a user of a system. Therefore, by improving upon the graphical user interface it accomplishes a user-friendly system, which is a well-known goal in the art of computer technology.

References Cited

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. patent 6421675, Ryan et al. Teaches information retrieval system that automatically updates.

U.S. patent 6006225, Bowman et al. Teaches a search engine that has query refinement and offline process generation of a query look up table.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

¹⁹ Web publishing tool that allows a user to indicate how postings should appear

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571)272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Pham

Examiner

2163

September 14, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Pham".